

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 RANDY ROHDE,

11 Plaintiff(s),

12 vs.

13 PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE  
14 COMPANY,

15 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-cv-00620-GMN-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 14)

16 Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated protective order. Docket No. 14. Read  
17 literally, the stipulated protective order would subject the Court and its staff to civil liability for any  
18 disclosure of confidential information if contrary to the terms of the stipulated protective order. *See id.*  
19 at ¶ 14; *see also id.* at ¶ 3(d) (identifying Court officials as "qualified persons"). This is problematic for  
20 numerous reasons. First, the Court has its own duty to apply Ninth Circuit standards to unseal materials  
21 as appropriate even though those materials may have been designated as confidential pursuant to the  
22 stipulated protective order. *See, e.g., Florence v. Cenlar Fed. Savings & Loan*, 2017 WL 1078637, at  
23 \*4 n.5 (D. Nev. Mar. 20, 2017) (the mere fact that a document is designated confidential pursuant to a  
24 stipulated protective order does not ensure the Court will maintain that document under seal once filed).<sup>1</sup>  
25 Second, Court officials are absolutely immune from civil liability in conjunction with exercising judicial  
26 functions. *See, e.g., Burton v. Infinity Capital Mgmt.*, 862 F.3d 740, 747-48 (9th Cir. 2017) (discussing  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> The stipulated protective order implicitly acknowledges this elsewhere. *See* Docket No. 14 at ¶ 17.

1 reach of absolute judicial immunity). Accordingly, the Court declines to enter the parties' proposed  
2 stipulated protective order in its current form, and it is hereby **DENIED**.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: August 16, 2017

5  
6   
NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge